UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/533,781	03/24/2000	Sriram Ramani	HP10992784	2479

			EXAMINER
22879	7590	06/03/2005	BASEHOAR, ADAM L

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2178	

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/533,781	RAMANI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Adam L Basehoar	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 March 2005_.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under _Ex parte Quayle_, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-23_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some *   c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: The Amendment filed 03/02/05 to the RCE

filed on 09/07/04 to the original application filed on 03/24/00.

2.   . Claims 21-23 have been added as necessitated by Amendment.

3.   The Objection to claim 20 has been withdrawn as necessitated by Amendment.

4.   Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-20 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Byford (US-6,220,509 04/24/01).

5.   Claim 7 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byford (US-

6,220,509 04/24/01) in view of W3C's "XML 1.0", 02/10/98 http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-

xml-19980210#sec-intro.

6.   Claim 10 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byford

(US-6,220,509 04/24/01) in further view Tabb et al (US: 6,493,731 02/11/97).

7.   Claims 1-23 are pending in this case. Claims 1, 11, and 18 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the

basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed
> in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for
> patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an
> international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this
> subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United
> States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9.   Claims 1-6, 8-9, 11-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by

Byford (US-6,220,509 04/24/01).

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Byford teaches a first set of data fields

(Fig. 2: 90), wherein the data fields represent attributes of a parent transaction and include a sub-

identifier field (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL ID); and

wherein a first set of metadata populates the first set of data fields (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL

ID, LOCATION, SERVICE) and describes the attributes represented by the first set of data

fields, the sub-identifier field including metatdata (i.e. PARCEL ID) from the first set of

metadata that identifies a second transaction (Fig. 2: Database 20), the metadata in the sub-

identifier field including linking data (i.e. PARCEL ID generated at both locations and linked by

URL) generated by the secondary transaction to link the secondary transaction to the active

document, and changing the contents of the active document if corresponding contents of the

second transaction have been changed (columns 2 & 3, lines 66-67 & 1-5).

-In regard to dependent claim 2, Byford teaches a parent transaction resource comprising

the first set of data fields (Fig. 2: Database 90) and the first set of metadata (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL

ID, LOCATION, SERVICE).

-In regard to dependent claims 3-4 and 12-13, Byford teaches wherein the sub-identifier

field (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL ID) links the parent transaction resource to a sub transaction resource

(Fig. 2: 20) which comprises a second set of data fields (Fig. 2: Database 20) and a second set of

metadata (Fig. 2: 20: PARCEL ID, URL-TCP/IP, CLIENT, LOCATION) that represent the

attributes of the secondary transaction (parcel delivery), wherein changes in the secondary

transaction (column 3, lines 35-44) would be reflected in the parent transaction resource via the

link (columns 2 & 3, lines 66-67 & 1-5). Byford further teach wherein the second set of

metadata (Fig. 2: 20: PARCEL ID, URL-TCP/IP, CLIENT, LOCATION) comprises relational

data that corresponds to the first set of data fields (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL ID, LOCATION,

SERVICE) and wherein a change to the transaction specific data was made in the corresponding

data field by populating the corresponding data field with transaction specific data (columns 2 &

3, lines 66-67 & 1-5).

        -In regard to dependent claim 5, Byford teaches wherein the first set of metadata was

stored in a repository (Fig. 2: 80) that was accessed by a core (controller)(Fig. 2: 70).

        -In regard to dependent claim 6, Byford teaches wherein the core matches the sub-

identifier field to the secondary transaction resource and updates the first of data fields by

populating at least one data field with data generated by the secondary transaction (columns 2 &

3, lines 54-67 & 1-5).

        -In regard to dependent claims 8 and 19, Byford teaches wherein the data fields include

permission fields (Fig. 2: 90: URL) which includes metadata (i.e. the client's URL) that specifies

who can access the active document (i.e. only clients at that address) and allowing client access

to the document if the client is permitted to access the parent transaction resource (columns 2 &

3, lines 46-53 & 35-38).

-In regard to dependent claim 9, Byford teaches wherein the data fields include a second

sub-identifier (Fig. 2: 90: Additional PARCEL IDs: Links all sub-transaction resources related to

the parent transaction through the URL) that includes metadata that identifies a second secondary

transaction (Fig. 2: 90: PARCEL ID, LOCATION, SERVICE), linking data generated by the

second transaction to the active document in the same way as the first transaction (column 3,

lines 35-49).

-In regard to dependent claim 14, Byford teaches populating the sub-identifier field with

metadata that identifies the secondary transaction (column 3, lines 35-49); and

populating the identifier field with metadata that identifies the parent transaction (column

3, lines 35-49).

-In regard to dependent claim 15, Byford teaches registering the parent transaction

resource and the sub-transaction resource in a repository (Fig. 2: 60, 80, 90), whereby the first set

of metadata and the second set may be accessed and update (column 2, lines 66-67 & 1-5).

-In regard to dependent claims 16 and 17, Byford teaches wherein the code submitted

was possibly written in the Perl programming language which supports extensible markup

language, wherein the code comprises the first set of data fields and the first set of metadata via

the database (column 3, lines 5-10).

-In regard to dependent claim 20, Byford teach displaying the updated transaction to the

client using a web browser (column 3, lines 28-34)(Fig. 2: 90).

-In regard to dependent claims 21-23 Byford teaches wherein multiple related

transactions (Fig. 2: 60': All transactions belonging to the same client ID are thus related) are

tracked using the active document (Fig. 2: 90)(column 2, lines 54-59; column 3, lines 35-44).

10.   Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byford (US-

6,220,509 04/24/01) in view of W3C's "XML 1.0", 02/10/98 http://www.w3.org/TR/1998/REC-

xml-19980210#sec-intro.

-In regard to dependent claim 7, Byford teaches wherein the active document was capable

of being displayed by a web browser (column 3, lines 28-34)(Fig. 2: 90). Byford also teaches

wherein the active document could be written in PERL and other programming languages that

were well known to support extensible markup language. Byford does not specifically teach

wherein the active document was written in extensible markup language. W3C teaches that it

would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have

written the transactions in XML, because XML documents were known to be easy to write and

process for web based applications (Introduction).

11.   Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byford (US-

6,220,509 04/24/01) in further view Tabb et al (US: 6,493,731 02/11/97).

-In regard to dependent claim 10, Byford teaches wherein the active document and the

secondary document were parcel delivery orders. Byford does not teach where the parent

document was a purchase order and where the secondary documents was a sales order. Tabb et

al teach a similar document database system wherein the active document was a purchase order

and the linked secondary document was a sales order (Fig. 7B). It would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, for Byford to have displayed linked

purchase and sales orders with the parcel delivery source, because Tabb et al teach that by doing

so users can automatically be kept up-to-date with all related data pertaining to the status of their

delivery order (Abstract). It was also notoriously well known at the time of the invention that

delivery services charged a fee for their service including shipping and handling and thus as

discussed in the Tabb et al reference should have automatically cross-indexed and linked the data

to the delivery order to keep users referenced with all the up-to-date data.

Response to Arguments

12.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/02/05 have been fully considered but they are not

persuasive.

-In regard to independent claims 1, 11, and 18, Applicant argues Byford does not disclose

or suggest an "active document which includes attributes of a parent transaction and linking data

generated by the secondary transaction to the active document and change contents of the active

document if corresponding contents of the second transaction have been changed." The

Examiner respectfully disagrees with the Applicant. Byford clearly teaches an active document

(Fig. 2: 90: client browser parcel status page) which includes attributes of a parent transaction

(Fig. 2: 90: "PARCEL ID" "LOCATION" "SERVICE") and linking data (i.e. client

URL)(column 2, lines 54-67) generated by the secondary transaction (i.e. parcel gets scanned at

an intermediate location)(column 2, lines 34-46) to the active document and change contents of

the active document (column 3, lines 1-19) if corresponding contents of the second transaction

have changed (i.e. if relay software triggered by changes in the secondary transaction)(column 2,

lines 54-54-59).

In general Byford teaches a parcel tracking system wherein a client establishes an active

document on their local browser which represents a parent transaction of multiple secondary

transactions of different parcel data. When any number of different secondary transaction parcel

reach a new intermediate location, the secondary transaction causes the system to link to the

monitoring parent transaction and populates the parent transaction with the relevant data

pertaining to that specific secondary transaction. The examiner wishes to point out that as

claimed the parent transaction and the secondary transactions need only be related and thus do

not have to be distinct transactions.

In regard to the newly added claims, please reference the above rejections.

Conclusion

13.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing

date of this final action.

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Adam L Basehoar whose telephone number is (571)-272-4121.

The examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 7:00am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Steve Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ALB

STEPHEN HONG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER